DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 377 CS 503 797

AUTHOR Botan, Carl H.; Frey, Lawrence R.
TITLE Trust in the Union: The Effects of Affiliation and Gender on Message Reception.
PUB DATE Apr 82
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Milwaukee, WI, April 15-17, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; *Communication Research; Communication Skills; *Credibility; Group Dynamics; *Organizational Communication; *Sex Differences; *Union Members; Unions

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the perceptions workers had of labor unions. Affiliation behavior and gender differences were employed as independent variables with respect to workers' attributions of trustworthiness in labor unions and their messages, as measured by the three dimensions of character, expertise, and dynamism of the Giffin Trust Differential questionnaire. All workers, 3,600 union members and 625 nonunion members, in a metropolitan postal district were surveyed. Data gathered from the more than 700 returned questionnaires revealed that affiliation behavior was the primary determinant of perceived trust in the labor union and its messages. Gender differences were also demonstrated to have a significant effect on attributions of trustworthiness, with union member males trusting the union on all dimensions to a significantly greater degree than union member females. These findings, however, were found to vary significantly according to affiliation behavior, with no significant differences in attributions of trustworthiness for male or female nonunion members. Finally, workers' attributions of trustworthiness toward the labor union were consistently higher than their attributions of trustworthiness toward labor unions' messages. (Copies of the questionnaire and its scoring key are appended.) (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215377

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TRUST IN THE UNION:

THE EFFECTS OF AFFILIATION AND GENDER ON MESSAGE RECEPTION

Paper Submitted for the

Central States Speech Association Convention

Milwaukee, Wisconsin - April, 1982

Divisional Program - Organization/Business Communication

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carl H. Botan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Carl H. Botan
Department of Speech Communication
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48221
(313) 867-4964

and

Lawrence R. Frey
Assistant Professor
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48221
(313) 577-2959

CS503797

TRUST IN THE UNION:

THE EFFECTS OF AFFILIATION AND GENDER ON MESSAGE RECEPTION

A central focus for research investigations within the field of speech communication concerns the communicative strategies which people employ within their interactions. While this source-oriented investigation of message strategies is important, equally important is an understanding about the ways in which people perceive, attribute meaning, and respond to such communication attempts.

Another area in which communication research has progressed is the study of gender differences. Research studies on gender differences have proceeded along numerous lines, ranging from: (a) perceptual abilities and personality (see Maccoby & Jacklin review, Vols. I, II, 1974); to (b) social/small group interactions (see Baird review, 1976), such as power relationships (see Baird & Gritzmacher review, 1979) and leadership roles (see Rosenfeld & Fowler review, 1976); to (c) dyadic interactions, as in conversational and relational control sequences (see Ellis & Skerchock review, 1979), story receipt (McLaughlin, Cody, Kane & Robey, 1981), and conflict resolution strategies (Roloff & Greenberg, 1979); to (d) communication effects, such as language usage (Liska, Mechling & Stathas, 1981), self-disclosure and communication apprehension (Greenblatt, Hasenauer & Freimuth, 1980), and ability to decode nonverbal messages (Isenhart, 1980). While related studies on gender differences and persuasibility/source credibility are numerous (see Rosenfeld & Christie review, 1974; and Markel, Long & Saine review, 1976), they have, however, been concerned almost exclusively with analyses of the processes associated with attitude change. These studies have not targeted gender differences with regard to the types of attributions which receivers form toward sources and their messages.

A third major thrust of communication research has been the study of communicative behavior within applied settings. Such studies have explored areas as widely diverse as: (a) organizational communication; (b) health communication;

(c) communication education; (d) social/political communication; and (e) legal communication. One significant institution/organization which has been virtually ignored is organized labor.

With approximately 98 million members in the employed U.S. labor force (Monthly Labor Review, August, 1981, p. 71), there are approximately 21%, or 21,784,000 labor union members (Taylor & Whitney, 1979, p. 8; Handbook of Labor Statistics, December, 1980, p. 412). Over 23% of these labor union members are female (Statistical Abstract, 1980, p. 429). Therefore, the study of the labor force, and labor unions in particular, represents a significant sector for research concerned with communicative behavior and the study of gender differences. This paper investigates affiliation behavior and gender differences in message reception with respect to the attributions formed toward sources within the labor union setting. Specifically, this research project focuses upon understanding affiliation behavior and gender differences with regard to the perceived trustworthiness of unions and their messages.

Review of Relevant Research

The following review will focus on four areas of concern: (1) the role of non-economic factors in union membership; (2) the role of women within the labor force and within labor unions; (3) the nature of communication behavior/channels within labor unions; and (4) the nature of trust as a significant yardstick for assessing individuals' attitudes toward labor unions and their messages.

Numerous sources have indicated that the desire for membership in a labor union is primarily a function of perceived economic advantage (Hamner, 1978; Strauss, 1963; Schriesheim, 1978). Other sources have indicated that the desire for union membership is primarily a function of perceived non-economic advan-

tages, such as seniority rights, grievance procedure, political influence, or a combination of economic and non-economic expectations (Smith, R. & Hopkins, 1979; Hamner & Smith, J., 1978).

If economic considerations are the primary factor in the desire for union membership, or non-union membership, do they completely determine workers' affiliation decisions? For example, who don't all workers support the union for their own economic gain? Or, why don't all workers oppose the union for the same reason? Even if economic considerations are the primary factor, they are clearly acted upon and modified by other factors. What other factors come to bear on the economic considerations, such that plant "A" will vote for a union while plant "B", under the same general conditions, will vote against the union?

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor has reported that the American union movement has dwindled from 25.5% of the nation's labor force in 1953 to 19.7% of the nation's non-agricultural labor force in 1978 (Handbook of Labor Statistics, December, 1980, p. 412). On a related front, American workers are voting against union representation in record numbers. In the twelve month period which ended September 30, 1980, unions won only 45% of the 8,043 representation elections held, the smallest percentage since the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) was created fourty-five years ago (Wall Street Journal, 07/28/1980, section 2, p. 1). Workers are also voting to decertify unions as their bargaining agents at a record rate. NLRB statistics demonstrate that in seven out of ten decertification elections, workers have voted against remaining unionized (Detroit Free Press, 04/13/1980, p. 4B).

This reduction in union strength is occuring while the economic status of American workers has been deteriorating, further exposing the fallacy that economic concerns alone determine workers' willingness to be represented by a union. Thus, choosing or rejecting union membership is too complex a behavior to

be accounted for by any one factor. A number of attitudinal factors clearly influence this decision-making process. Since American workers, on the whole, view labor unions as good for their bread and butter interests (Getman, Goldberg & Herman , 1976; Kochan, 1979; Schreisheim, 1978), they must have some perceptions, reservations, misunderstandings, and/or other attributions which lead the majority of them to reject labor unions. Since attitudes "act as predispositions for the individual to behave preferentially toward the objects of the attitude" (Littlejohn, 1978, p. 168), the study of workers' attitudes toward labor unions may be a major contribution to explaining the seeming paradox between workers' perceptions of labor unions and their affiliation behavior toward them.

The need to investigate gender differences in message reception becomes significant when one realizes the influence females are having upon the labor force and the labor unions. In an employed civilian labor force of 98,868,000, there are 38,929,000 females over twenty years of age, or about 39% of the employed adult population (Kutscher, August, 1981, p. 10). Females probably constitute a similar proportion of the 7,256,000 employed workers of both sexes, age 16-19 years. In terms of labor union membership, females represented 23.44% of the membership in 1978, or 5,106,000 total female union members (Handbood of Labor Statistics, December, 1980, p. 412). This is in spite of the fact that many of the national labor unions had no female members in 1978, and the fact that females hold a disproportionately small percentage of leadership positions within labor unions (Wertheimer & Nelson, 1975; Boyd, 1981). Finally, the percentage of women who are employed is expected by the government to increase from the current figure of 51% to 56.4-63.2% by the year 1990 (Kutscher, August, 1981, p. 10). This means that out of a total 117-128 million employed civilian workers in the U.S. Labor force in the year 1990, 53.5-59.9 million will be female.

From the above figures, it is apparent that the role played by females within

the labor force, and within labor unions, will be increasing significantly in the next decade. However, research which investigates females' attitudes toward labor unions and their messages, has been almost non-existent. Wertheimer and Nelson (1975) argued that one major factor contributing to the low level of female participation in labor unions was "lack of information". Boyd (1981) concluded that women labor union members are very interested in their union and would like more information about their union, but that women labor unionists have difficulty getting information from their elected officials.

The limited studies cited above suggest that female workers' attitudes is one untapped area of study which has potential for contributing to an understanding about workers' attitudes toward labor unions and the viability of labor unions for the future. Further, studies such as Wertheimer and Nelson (1975) and Boyd (1981) suggest that female workers' perceptions of the messages they receive from labor unions is a substantive area of concern for speech communication research.

From a speech communication perspective, it is essential to study not only how people perceive others and institutions, but, more importantly, how they perceive message attempts directed at them. The nature and function of communication channels within the union is an area which has not received extensive examination. However, the consensus of what research does exist is that the communication needs of workers are not being adequately met by labor unions. The U.S. Department of Labor study (Kochan, 1978) reported that 69.7% of labor union members agreed that "more feedback from the union" should be the highest priority for their labor union. This perceived need for improved communication within the labor union was exceeded only by the perceived need for improvements in grievance handling, as indicated by 78.5% of the labor union respondents. Dee (1959) summed up this issue by stating that, "In the past, labor has paid relatively little attention to its internal communication activities" (p. 100).

Dee, in a series of articles (1959, 1960, 1962, 1968), examined labor union communication channels and needs and identified several types of communication channels within the labor union. These included: (1) informal/personal channels, made up of groups, cliques, teams, clubs, and followings; (2) regular meetings; (3) stewards and representatives; (4) international representatives and business agents (professional full-time people, distinct from point number 3 above); (5) key-men, benefits representatives, safety representatives, etc.; (6) bulletin boards; (7) local newspapers; (8) other printed communication, such as fliers, leaflets, bulletins, etc.; and (9) other verbal communication, such as telephones, families, etc.

Dee (1959) also concluded that many factors determined which communication channels operated, and how well they operated, within each local labor union. These factors included: (1) past history; (2) size; (3) geography (for example, is the local a single unit or amalgamated?); (4) ethnic makeup; (5) wealth; and (6) relationship with management. Dee (1959) also reported that bulletin boards and meetings are the top-rated sources of information, and that the potential of these two sources has not been fully used by labor union leaders.

With the exception of the studies by Wertheimer and Nelson (1975) and Boyd (1981), no specific information is available addressing the communicative behavior of women within labor unions, women's roles in labor union communication channels, or women's reactions to labor unions' communication attempts. Obviously, female workers' perceptions of labor unions' communicative behavior is a crucial area for speech communication research.

Spinrad (1960) has concluded that the most serious problem in the majority of labor unions is that of effective communication. Therefore, this study seeks to ascertain how workers not only perceive their labor union as an institution, but also their perceptions of the messages they receive from their labor union. Rather

than identifying specifc communication channels for respondents to assess (i.e., written messages only), workers were asked about their perceptions concerning their labor union and their labor union's messages in general (see methodology section). This study examines the relationship between the variables of labor union affiliation and gender differences with respect to workers' perceptions of their labor union and its messages. Thus, this study focuses on workers' attitudinal attributions about labor unions and their messages and does not compare them with the influence of non-attitudinal factors, such as pay, fringe benefits, or a check-off clause in the contract.

While there are multiple indicators for assessing attitudinal predispositions and attributions toward institutions and their messages, this study focuses upon workers' perceptions of the trustworthiness of labor unions and their messages. The construct of trust is used because:

> The ultimate objective of research on human behavior is to determine the relationship between two (or more) behaviors; an example of two such behaviors might be (1) instructional communication on the part of a job supervisor and (2) the implementation of these instructions on the part of the employee. However, the concept and the attitude of the employee toward the supervisor (for example, the degree to which the employee trusts the supervisor) is also of extreme importance because the use of such a construct as "trust" can explain the relationship between the two behaviors (Giffin, 1973, p. 1, author's italics).

The study of trust and its implications for behavior has received widespread attention in the speech communication discipline. However, because trust is a construct, it cannot be directly observed, but must be inferred from observable responses which people demonstrate on introspective questionnaires. Giffin (1973) has defined the notion of trust as comprising three central factors - expertness, character, and dynamism - which were used to construct the Giffin Trust Differential questionnaire.

Items comprising the factor of expertness are concerned with attributions about

a referent with respect to knowledge, expertness, intelligence, experience, education, amount of training and information, and the degree of being logical. The factor of character concerns attributions about the reliability and intentions of a referent. Giffin and McClearey (1978) reported that, "this factor reflected perceived consideration of others; its essence appeared to be reliability on the side of morality and justice" (p. 10). Specific items for the measurement of this factor include perceptions of respectfulness, kindness, honesty, goodness, unselfishness, sincerity, morality, patience, and niceness. Finally, the factor of dynamism concerns attributions about a referent with regard to such items as boldness, aggressiveness, extroversion, frankness, swiftness, activeness, being empathic, and being energetic. These three factors can be looked at separately and/or combined to form an overall measure of the perception of trust (with the three dimensions weighted as follows: character, 64%; dynamism, 21%; and expertness, 15%).

Thus, this study investigates workers' trust in labor union's behaviors and messages with respect to their perceived expertness, intentions toward the well-being of workers, and dynamism. In practical terms, this study seeks to shed light on questions about workers' perceptions of their labor union, in general, and union messages, in specific. For example, do union members and non-union members see the labor union and its messages as significantly different? Furthermore, this study seeks to ascertain whether differences in affiliation behavior and gender affect workers' attributions of the trustworthiness of labor unions and their messages.

Hypotheses

The preceeding discussion suggests the following hypotheses for this study:

Union Membership

H_0: Labor union and non-union members will demonstrate no significant differences in perceptions of trust toward (a) their union and (b) their union's messages.

H_1: Labor union members will demonstrate a significantly greater degree of trust in (a) their union and (b) their union's messages than will non-union members.

This research hypothesis predicts that because of their involvement with the labor union, members should demonstrate a significantly greater degree of trust in their union and its messages than will non-members. Since non-union members have rejected the choice of labor union membership, we would expect them to have a lower perception of their union's expertness, character, and dynamism than labor union members. This hypothesis thus maintains that affiliation behavior with a labor union should be a significant factor which contributes to perceptions of trust in a labor union and its messages.

Gender Differences

H_{0_A} : Male and female workers will demonstrate no significant differences in perceptions of trust toward (a) their labor union and (b) their labor union's messages.

H_{2_A} : Male workers will demonstrate a significantly greater degree of trust toward (a) their labor union and (b) their labor union's messages than will female workers.

This research hypothesis argues that significant differences should be expected between male and female workers toward unions. This should be true because women have historically not played an equal role in labor unions, as demonstrated by numbers of members, percentage of leadership posts, and decision-making authority (Koziara & Pierson, 1981).

H_{2_B} : Male non-labor union members will demonstrate a significantly greater degree of trust toward (a) their union and (b) their union's messages than will female non-labor union members.

H_{2_C} : Male labor union members will demonstrate a significantly greater degree of trust toward (a) their union and (b) their union's messages than will female labor union members.

H_{2_D} : Female labor union members will demonstrate a significantly greater degree of trust toward (a) their union and (b) their union's messages than will male non-union members.

H_{2_E} : Male union members will demonstrate a significantly greater degree of trust toward (a) their union and (b) their union's messages than will female non-labor union members.

These research hypotheses seek to explore the gender difference effects which result when the independent variable of union membership is partialed out. Because of the role which women have traditionally played within the labor unions, directional differences with respect to gender would be expected, with males trusting the union and its messages to a significantly greater degree than females, with the exception of hypothesis 2D, in which union membership should override gender differences.

Methodology

Subjects

In order to control as much as possible for the influence of economic considerations and focus upon the nature of attitudes toward a labor union, an open shop was selected for this study. An open shop is one in which there is a labor union and a contract; however, employees are not required to join the labor union or pay for their representation. All employees in an open shop receive the same pay and benefits, those negotiated in the union contract. By law, the labor union must provide full and equal representation to all employees.

In an open shop, there is no apparent financial reward for joining the union. In fact, voluntarily joining the labor union will cost the worker dues (approximately $15 per month) which he/she does not have to pay to get representation. Many labor union supporters suggest that the reason some workers do not join the labor union in an open shop is that fact that they are feeeloading, trying to get the

service and avoid paying their own way. This reasoning flies in the face of the fact that in many cases, including this one, a sizable majority of workers join the labor union. If the small expense is not the deciding factor for those who join the labor union, why would it be the major factor for those who do not join the labor union? It is possible that other factors, such as attitudinal ones, affect the decision to affiliate with a labor union.

A post office district was selected for this study, in which approximately 3,600 employees are labor union members while approximately 625 are non-union members, more than a 5.5-to-1 ratio in favor of the labor union.

Independent Variables

Two independent variables were focused upon in this study. Subjects were identified with respect to union membership (whether they were members of their union or not) and with respect to their gender.

Dependent Variables

The Giffin Trust Differential (see Appendix A) was used as the dependent measure of trust. This instrument measures the three factors of character, expertness, and dynamism (each ranging from 9-63) and an overall trust score (ranging from 27-189). The questionnaire used was a modification of this instrument. The modification involved the substitution of the word outgoing for the term extroverted, as subjects in pretesting demonstrated difficulty in understanding this term. In the pretesting of this modified Giffin Trust Differential, no significant differences existed between the modified form and the original instrument (t value = .69, with 13 degrees of freedom).

The modified form of the Giffin Trust Differential was used to assess workers' perceptions about their labor union in general and their labor union's messages, in specific. Half of the labor union and non-union members were asked to complete the trust instrument with respect to the statement, "The union is _____";

while the other half of the labor union and non-union members were asked to complete the trust instrument using the referent, "The union's messages are _____". This procedure thus allows for the comparison between perceptions of a labor union's behaviors in general and its behavior with regard to the communicative messages which are received by workers.

Procedure

The modified form of the Giffin Trust Differential was mailed to all bargaining unit employees in a metropolitan postal district. In all, 4225 questionnaires were mailed , of which 3,600 went to labor union members and 625 went to non-union members. Mailings contained a cover letter explaining the purpose of this study, an instruction sheet and demographic questionnaire, the modified form of the Giffin Trust Differential, and a postage-paid return envelope. Follow-up postcards were mailed to all subjects ten to fourteen days after the initial mailing, reminding them to send in their questionnaires. Annonymity was assured as no specific personal identification was involved in completing the questionnaires. In total, 866 questionnaires were returned, of which 710 were complete enough for use in this study. Of the 710 returned, 585 labor union members and 125 non-union members were represented; 366 females and 344 males responded; of the non-union members, 82 were female while 43 were male; of the labor union members, 284 were female while 301 were male.

Data Treatment

The effects of the independent variables of union membership and gender differences were tested with respect to the four dimensions of perceived trust in the union and the union's messages (expertness, character, dynamism, and total trust) by the use of t-tests in order to accept or reject the null hypotheses.

Results

Union Membership

Table I indicates that labor union members, with respect to all dimensions of the trust insturment, demonstrated a significantly greater degree of trust in their labor union than did non-union members (at the less than .001 level of probability). Subsequent analyses identified significant differences between all subscales of the trust instrument for both union members (at the less than .001 level of probability; 2-tailed test) and non-union members (at the less than .01 level of probability, 2-tailed test). Specifically, trust in the character dimension of the labor union by union members (mean = 45.335) was significantly greater than trust in the expertness dimension (mean = 42.259) which, in turn, was significantly greater than trust in the dynamism dimension (mean = 40.308). For non-union members, trust in the character of the labor union (mean = 40.090) was significantly greater than trust in the expertness dimension (mean = 36.090) which, in turn, was significantly greater than trust in the dynamism dimension (mean = 33.224).

Table 2 indicates that labor union members, with respect to all dimensions of the trust instrument, demonstrated a significantly greater degree of trust in their labor union's messages than did non-union members (at the less than .001 level of probability). Subsequent analyses demonstrated that there were significant differences between all subscales of the trust instrument for union members (at the less than .001 level of probability) and some of the subscales of the trust instrument for non-union members. Specifically, trust in the character dimension of the labor union's messages by union members (mean = 42.842) was significantly greater than trust in the expertness dimension (mean = 41.494) which, in turn, was significantly greater than trust in the dynamism dimension (mean = 37.984). For non-union members, significant subscale differences were demonstrated between the charac-

TABLE 1: UNION AFFILIATION AND TRUST IN THE UNION

	Members	Non-Members	t-value	df	sig.
Character	M = 45.225 SD = 12.031	M = 40.090 SD = 11.52	-3.21	328	.001
Expertness	M = 42.260 SD = 12.924	M = 36.090 SD = 13.123	-3.48	328	.001
Dynamism	M = 40.308 SD = 12.832	M = 33.223 SD = 12.548	-4.05	328	.000
Total	M = 127.901 SD = 35.083	M = 109.403 SD =33. 941	-3.88	328	.000

TABLE 2: UNION AFFILIATION AND TRUST IN UNION MESSAGES

	Members	Non-Members	t-value	df	sig.
Character	M = 42.842 SD = 13.085	M = 35.207 SD = 12.310	-4.13	378	.000
Expertness	M = 41.494 SD = 13.243	M = 35.672 SD = 11.467	-3.14	378	.002
Dynamism	M = 37.984 SD = 13.623	M = 32.103 SD = 13.385	-3.03	378	.003
Total	M = 122. 320 SD = 37.771	M = 102.983 SD = 33.633	-3.65	378	.000

ter (mean = 35.207) and expertness dimensions (mean = 35.672) and the dynamism dimension (mean = 32.103; both comparisons significant at the less than .05 level of probability). However, there was no significant difference between the dimensions of character and expertness.

Thus, the null hypothesis with regard to the effects of union membership must be rejected, as labor union members demonstrated a significantly greater degree of trust on all dimensions of the trust instrument with respect to perceptions of the union, in general, and the union's messages, in specific. In addition, comparisons between perceptions of trust in the union and the union's messages revealed significant differences with respect to the character dimension. Specifically, workers, regardless of affiliation, demonstrated significantly greater trust in the character dimension of the union (mean = 44.270) than in the character dimension of the union's messages (mean = 41.676; significant at the .007 level of of probability, with a 2-tailed test).

Gender Differences

Table 3 indicates that male workers demonstrated significantly greater overall trust in the union, and greater trust in the dimensions of expertness and dynamism, than did female workers (at the less than .05 level of probability). Subsequent analyses demonstrated that there were significant differences between all subscales of the trust instrument for both male and female workers (at the less than .001 level of probability, 2-tailed test). Specifically, trust in the character dimension of the labor union by male workers (mean = 45.255) was significantly greater than trust in the expertness dimension (mean = 42.600) which, in turn, was significantly greater than trust in the dynamism dimension (mean = 40.460). This same effect was also significant for female workers (character mean = 43.331; expertness mean = 39.491; and dynamism mean = 37.355).

Table 4 indicates that male workers demonstrated significantly greater overall

trust in the union's messages, and greater trust in the dimensions of character and expertness, than did female workers (at the less than .05 level of probability). Subsequent analyses demonstrated that there were significant differences between all subscales of the trust instrument for both male and female workers (at the less than .05 level of probability, 2-tailed test). Specifically, trust in the character dimension of the labor union's messages by male workers (mean = 43.060) was significantly greater than trust in the expertness dimension (mean = 41.836) which, in turn, was significantly greater than trust in the dynamism dimension (mean = 37.847). This same effect was significant for female workers (character mean= 40.391; expertness mean = 39.462; and dynamism mean = 36.381).

Thus, the null hypothesis with regard to the effects of gender must be rejected, as male workers demonstrated a significantly greater degree of trust on three of the four dimensions of the trust instrument with respect to perceptions of both the union, in general, and the union's messages, in specific, than did females. Comparisons between perceptions of trust in the union and the union's messages were not significant for males. However, females demonstrated significantly greater trust on the character dimension for the union (mean = 43.331) than on the character dimension of the union's messages (mean = 40.391; at the .022 level of probability, 2-tailed test).

Tables 5-8 demonstrate gender effects with respect to perceived trust in the labor union and the union's messages when the independent variable of union membership is controlled. Table 5 indicates that male labor union members trust the union to a significantly greater degree, with respect to all dimensions of the trust instrument than do female labor union members (at the .05 level of probability). Subsequent analyses demonstrated that there were significant differences between all subscales of the trust instrument for both male and female labor union members (at the .05 level of probability, 2-tailed test). Specifically, trust

TABLE 3: GENDER DIFFERENCES AND TRUST IN THE UNION

	Male	Female	t-value	df	sig.
Character	M = 45.255 SD = 12.529	M = 43.331 SD = 11.632	-1.45	328	.075
Expertness	M = 42.596 SD = 13.362	M = 39.491 SD = 12.864	-2.15	328	.016
Dynamism	M = 40.460 SD = 13.138	M = 37.355 SD = 12.835	-2.17	328	.016
Total	M = 128.311 SD = 36.915	M = 120.177 SD = 33.920	-2.09	328	.019

TABLE 4: GENDER DIFFERENCES AND TRUST IN UNION MESSAGES

	Male	Female	t-value	df	sig.
Character	M = 43.060 SD = 13.600	M = 40.391 SD = 12.803	-1.97	378	.025
Expertness	M = 41.836 SD = 13.243	M = 39.462 SD = 13.023	-1.76	378	.040
Dynamism	M = 37.847 SD = 13.925	M = 36.381 SD = 13.550	-1.04	378	.150
Total	M = 122.743 SD = 38.061	M = 116.233 SD = 37.330	-1.68	378	.047

in the character dimension of the labor union by male union members (mean = 46.768) was significantly greater than trust in the expertness dimension (mean = 44.101) which, in turn, was significantly greater than trust in the dynamism dimension (mean = 41.935). This same effect was significant for female labor union members (character mean = 43.752; expertness mean = 40.224; and dynamism mean = 38.512). Table 5 also indicates that there are no significant differences between male and female non-union members, except with respect to the dimension of character. For character scores, female non-union members trust the union (mean = 42.136) to a significantly greater degree than do male non-union members (mean = 36.174). Subsequent analyses demonstrated no significant differences between the subscales of the trust instrument with respect to perception of the union for female non-union members. However, for male non-union members, trust in the dimension of character for the labor union (mean = 36.164) was significantly greater than trust in the dimensions of expertness (mean = 33.565) and dynamism (31.609).

Table 6 indicates that there are no significant gender differences, regardless of the affiliation behavior, with respect to trust in the union's messages. Therefore, the null hypotheses for hypotheses 2B and 2C can only be partially rejected, since significant effects due to gender and affiliation were evident with regard to trust in the union, in general, but not with regard to trust in the union's messages.

Table 7 indicates that there are significant differences for cross-gender/affiliation and trust in the union. With respect to all comparisons, regardless of gender differences, persons holding membership in the labor union demonstrated significantly greater trust on all dimensions than did non-union members. Table 8 also demonstrates that there are significant differences across all comparisons with respect to trust of union messages, with members demonstrating significantly greater trust in all cases. Thus, the null hypotheses corresponding to the research

TABLE 5: GENDER DIFFERENCES/AFFILIATION BEHAVIOR AND TRUST IN THE UNION

		Male	Female	t-value	df	sig.
Character	Member	M = 46.768 SD = 11.997	M = 43.752 SD = 11.916	-2.04	261	.021
	Non-Member	M = 36.174 SD = 12.033	M = 42.136 SD = 10.823	2.06	65	.022
Expertness	Member	M = 44.101 SD = 12.873	M = 40.224 SD = 12.723	-2.45	261	.008
	Non-Member	M = 33.565 SD = 12.922	M = 37.409 SD = 13.179	-1.14	65	.129
Dynamism	Member	M = 41.935 SD = 12.86€	M = 38.512 SD = 12.604	-2.18	261	.015
	Non-Member	M = 31.609 SD = 11.610	M = 34.068 SD = 13.060	-0.76	65	.225
Total	Member	M = 132.804 SD = 35.425	M = 122.488 SD= 34.027	-2.40	261	.009
	Non-Member	M = 101.348 SD = 34.771	M = 113.614 SD = 33.117	1.42	65	.081

TABLE 6: GENDER DIFFERENCES/AFFILIATION BEHAVIOR AND TRUST IN UNION MESSAGES

		Male	Female	t-value	df	sig.
Character	Member	M = 43.755 SD =13.313	M = 41.906 SD = 12.822	-1.27	320	.103
	Non-Member	M = 37.400 SD = 14.919	M = 34.053 SD = 10.732	-0.98	56	.165
Expertness	Member	M = 42.509 SD = 12.867	M = 40.453 SD = 13.579	-1.40	320	.082
	Non-Member	M = 36.350 SD = 15.253	M = 35.316 SD = 9.441	-0.32	56	.376
Dynamism	Member	M = 38.957 SD = 13.590	M = 36.987 SD = 13.709	-1.30	320	.098
	Non-Member	M = 28.800 SD = 14.303	M = 33.842 SD = 12.725	1.37	56	.088
Total	Members	M = 125.221 SD = 37.087	M = 119.346 SD = 38.347	-1.40	320	.082
	Non-Member	M = 102.550 SD = 40.829	M = 103.210 SD = 29.773	0.07	56	.472

TABLE 7: CROSS-GENDER/AFFILIATION AND TRUST IN THE UNION

Dimension	Gender/Affiliation	Mean	SD	t-value	df	sig.
Character	Male/Non-Member	36.174	12.033	2.80	146	.003
	Female/Member	43.752	11.196			
	Male/Member	46.768	11.997	-2.28	180	.012
	Female/Non-Member	42.136	10.823			
Expertness	Male/Non-member	33.565	12.922	2.30	146	.012
	Female/Member	40.224	12.723			
	Male/Member	44.101	12.873	-2.99	180	.002
	Female/Non-Member	37.409	13.179			
Dynamism	Male/Non-Member	31.609	11.610	2.44	146	.008
	Female/Member	38.512	12.604			
	Male/Member	41.935	12.866	-3.52	180	.001
	Female/Non-Member	34.068	13.060			
Total	Male/Non-Member	101.348	23.771	2.73	146	.004
	Female/Member	122.488	34.027			
	Male/Member	132.804	35.425	-3.18	180	.001
	Female/Non-Member	113.614	33.117			

TABLE 8: CROSS-GENDER/AFFILIATION AND TRUST IN UNION MESSAGES

Dimension	Gender/Affiliation	Mean	SD	t-value	df	sig.
Character	Male/Non-Member	37.400	14.919	1.45	177	.079
	Female/Member	41.906	12,822			
	Male/Member	43.755	13.313	-4.18	199	.000
	Female/Non-Member	34.053	10.732			
Expertness	Male/Non-Member	36.350	15.253	1.26	177	.106
	Female/Member	40.453	13.579			
	Male/Member	42.509	12.867	-3.25	199	.001
	Female/Non-Member	35.316	9.441			
Dynamism	Male/Non-Member	28.800	14.303	2.51	177	.007
	Female/Member	36.987	13.709			
	Male/Members	38.957	13.509	-2.12	199	.018
	Female/Non-Members	33.842	12.725			
Total	Male/Non-members	102.500	40.829	1.83	177	.034
	Female/Members	119.346	38.347			
	Male/Members	125.221	37.087	-3.41	199	.001
	Female/Non-Members	103.210	29.773			

hypotheses 2D and 2E must be rejected, as significant effects were indicated by the data.

Discussion

This study has demonstrated that significant differences exist with respect to workers' perception of labor unions and their messages. Specifically, affiliation behavior and gender differences appear to be two major determinants of trust in the labor union and its messages. If this is true, this has important ramifications for research within the fields of speech communication and labor studies.

With regard to workers' trust in the labor union and the union's messages, affiliation behavior correlates positively with trust on all dimensions. Affiliation appears to have greater influence than the independent variable of gender differences in determining both trust in the labor union and trust in the labor union's messages. While gender differences were apparent within the findings of this study, these results were tempered by the independent variable of affiliation. Thus, while male workers demonstrated significantly greater trust in the union and the union's messages than female workers on most of the dimensions of the trust instrument, when we investigate finding more deeply, we discover the root of the issue. Hence, subsequent analyses demonstrated that the gender differences primarily occured with respect to those workers who were affiliated with the labor union. The only significant gender difference among non-affiliated workers was with respect to the dimension of character, with females being significantly higher than their male counterparts. However, for labor union members, males were significantly higher on all dimension of the trust instrument with respect to trust in the union. These findings confirm the affiliation research hypotheses, as well as the gender hypotheses, and can be easily understood in light of the fact that only

those workers who choose to do so become union members.

These findings are somewhat surprising because they indicate that, with respect to overall trust in the union, affiliated females have radically different views in comparison to their male counterparts than do non-affiliated females in comparison to their male counterparts. This gender difference in perceptions is probably the result of two factors: (1) the fact that differences between women members and non-members are considerably smaller than the differences between male union members and male non-union members (an inspection of the data, particularly Table 5 and the same-gender t-values, supports this interpretation) and (2) the finding that female and male union members differ to a significantly greater degree in their trust of the union than do female and male non-union members. Future research will need to pinpoint the locus of the significant gender differences for union members.

This study also demonstrated that there are significant differences between perceptions of trust in the union by workers and their perceptions of trust in the messages which they receive from the union. The findings from this study indicate that the union is consistently more highly trusted than are its messages, although the difference is only significant on the character dimension. It appears that the union in general has a reservior of goodwill among both union members and non-union members, especially on the dimension of character, which its messages have not lived up to. This indicates the need for the labor union to increase the frequency as well as the perceived intentions and competence/expertness of its communication. Future studies will need to assess more specifically the problems the union has communicating its accepted image.

One potential area for future research investigations concerns the significant differences between the subscales of the trust differential for both union members and non-union members, as well as for males and females, with respect

to both perceptions of the union and the union's messages. Specifically, the character dimension of the union, as well as its messages, are trusted to a significantly greater degree than the dimension of expertness, which, in turn, is trusted to a significantly greater degree than the dimension of dynamism. These findings suggest that trust in the character of the union and its messages is the strongpoint, while trust in the dynamism, or activeness, of the union and its messages is the weakest point. However, it is important to realize that all scores on all dimensions for both the union and its messages, with respect to male and females and members and non-members alike, achieved only a medium level of trust, given the ranges of the instrument. Future studies will need to investigate procedures by which labor unions can increase the frequency, quality, and trustworthiness of its actions, particularly with regard to its communicative behavior.

This exploratory study has been an initial attempt to understand how labor unions and their messages are perceived by workers within the labor force. Future studies will need to focus more specifically on explicating the reasons for the present study's findings as well as investigating how other independent variable (such as race, economic climate, geographical regions, personality, etc.) influence workers' perceptions of labor unions and their messages. If this study provides the impetus for other researchers to begin addressing these and other concerns in this massive, and almost unexplored, field, it will have served its purpose well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baird, John, Jr. Sex differences in group communication: A review of relevant research. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1976, 62., pp. 179-192

Baird, John & Gritzmacher, Karen. Power in organizations: Male-female perspectives. Paper presented to the International Communication Association Convention, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1979.

Boyd, Marilyn S. Women's Liberation Ideology and Union Participation: A Study. Saratoga, California: Century Twenty One Publishing, 1981.

Dee, James P. Written communication in the trade union local. Journal of Communication, 1959, ix., pp. 99-109.

Dee, James P. Oral communication in the trade union. Journal of Communication, 1960, x, pp. 77-86.

Dee, James P. Channels of talk in the union local. Today's Speech, 1962, 10, pp. 7-8.

Dee, James P. Communication needs of the active union member. Journal of Communication, 1968, 18, pp. 65-72.

Detroit Free Press, March 13, 1980, section B, p. 4.

Ellis, Donald & Skerchock, Linda. Relational control sequences in sex-typed and androgynous groups. Paper presented to the International Communication Association Convention, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1979.

Getman, Julius G., Goldberg, Stephen B. & Herman, Jeanne B. Union Representation: Law and Reality. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976. Cited by Kochan, Thomas A. How American workers view labor unions. Monthly Labor Review, April, 1979, 102, pp. 23-32.

Giffin, Kim. Interaction variables of interpersonal trust. Humanitas: Journal of the Institute of Man, 1973, IX, No. 3.

Giffin, Kim & McClearey, Kevin. A re-examination of the trust differential. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Communication Research Center, 1978.

Greenblatt, Lynda, Hassenauer, James E. & Freimuth, Vicki S. Psychological sex type and androgyny in the study of communication variables: Self-disclosure and communication apprehension. Human Communication Research, 1980, 6, pp. 117-129.

Hamner, Tove Helland. Relationships between local union characteristics and workers behavior and attitudes. Academy of Management Journal, 1978, 21, pp. 560-578.

Hamner, Clay W. & Smith, Frank J. Work attitudes as predictors of unionization activity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, pp. 415-421.

Handbook of Labor Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1980, p. 412.

Isenhart, Myra W. An investigation of the relationship of sex and sex role to the ability to decode nonverbal cues. Human Communication Research, 1980, 6, pp. 309-318.

Kochan, Thomas A. How American workers view labor unions. Monthly Labor Review, April, 1979, 102, pp. 23-32.

Koziara, K.S. & Pierson, D.A. The lack of female union leaders: A look at some reasons. Monthly Labor Review, May, 1981, 104, pp. 30-32.

Kutscher, Ronald E. New economic projections through 1990 - An overview. Monthly Labor Review, August, 1981, 104, pp. 9-17.

Liska, Jo, Mechling, Elizabeth Walker & Stathas, Susan. Differences in subjects' perceptions of gender and believability between users of differential and nondifferential language. Communication Quarterly, 1981, 29, pp. 40-48.

Littlejohn, Stephen W. Theories of Human Communication. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1978.

Maccoby, Eleanor Emons & Jacklin, Carol Nagy. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Vol. I & II. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974

Markel, Norman, Long, Joseph & Saine, Thomas. Sex effects in conversational interaction: Another look at male dominance. Human Communication Research, 1976, 2.

McLaughlin, Margaret L., Cody, Michael J, Kane, Marjorie L. & Robey, Carl S. Sex differences in story receipt and story sequencing behaviors in dyadic conversations. Human Communication Research, 1981, 7, pp. 99-116.

Roloff, Michael E. & Greenberg, Bradley S. Sex differences in choice of modes of conflict resolution in real-life and television. Communication Quarterly, 1979, 27, pp. 3-12.

Rosenfeld, Lawrence & Christie, Vickie. Sex and persuasibility revisitied. Western Speech, Fall, 1974, pp. 244-253.

Rosenfeld, Lawrence & Fowler, Gene. Personality, sex, and leadership style. Communication Monographs, 1976, 43, 320-324.

Schriesheim, Chester A. Job satisfaction, attitudes toward unions, and voting in a union representation election. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, pp. 548-552.

Smith, Ussell L. & Hopkins, Anne. Public employees attitudes toward unions. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 1979, 32, pp. 484-495.

Spinrad, William. Correlates of trade union participation: A summary of the literature. American Sociological Review, April, 1960, xxv, pp. 237-244. Cited in Boyd, Marilyn S. Women's Liberation Ideology and Union Participation: A Study. Saratoga, California: Century Twenty One Publishing, 1981.

Statistical Abstract. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 429.

Strauss, George. Union bargaining strength: Goliath or paper tiger. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, Nov., 1963, 350, pp. 86-94.

Wall Street Journal, July 28, 1980, section 2, p. 1, "Union rekindle organizing efforts with new tacits to lure members." Urban C. Lehner.

Wertheimer, Barbara & Nelson, Anne. Trade Union Women. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975. Cited in Boyd, Marilyn S. Women's Liberation Ideology and Union Participation: A Study. Saratoga, California: Century Twenty One Publishing, 1981.

APPENDIX I:

DEPENDENT MEASURE - GIFFIN TRUST DIFFERENTIAL

SCHOLARLY	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	UNSCHOLARLY
DISRESPECTFUL	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	RESPECTFUL
UNKNOWLEDGEABLE	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	KNOWLEDGEABLE
KIND	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	CRUEL
EMPHATIC	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	HESITANT
PASSIVE	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	ACTIVE
FAST	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	SLOW
MEEK	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	AGGRESIVE
EXPERT	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	IGNORANT
BOLD	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	TIMID
DISHONEST	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	HONEST
AGGRESSIVE	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	UNAGGRESSIVE
UNINFORMED	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	INFORMED
TRAINED	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	UNTRAINED
GOOD	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	BAD
INEXPERIENCED	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	EXPERIENCED
EDUCATED	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	UNEDUCATED
INTROVERTED	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____:	EXTROVERTED
ENERGETIC	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	TIRED
SELFISH	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	UNSELFISH
SINCERE	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	INSINCERE
IMMORAL	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	MORAL
PATIENT	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	IMPATIENT
INTELLIGENT	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	UNINTELLIGENT
ILLOGICAL	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	LOGICAL
AWFUL	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	NICE
RESERVED	____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____	FRANK

APPENDIX II:

SCORING KEY FOR GIFFIN TRUST DIFFERENTIAL

The following nine items are collected to score the factor of expertness and are tallied as indicated:

1. Scholarly - Unscholarly (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
3. Unknowledgeable - Knowledgeable (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).
9. Expert - Ignorant (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
13. Uninformed - Informed (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).
14. Trained - Untrained (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
16. Inexperienced - Experienced (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).
17. Educated - Uneducated (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
25. Illogical - Logical (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).

The following nine items are collected to score the factor of character (reliability plus intentions) and are tallied as indicated:

2. Disrespectful - Respectful (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).
4. Kind - Cruel (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
11. Dishonest - Honest (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).
15. Good - Bad (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
20. Selfish - Unselfish (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
21. Sincere - Insincere (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
22. Immoral - Moral (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).
23. Patient - Impatient (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
26. Awful - Nice (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).

The following nine items are collected to score the factor of dynamism (activeness and frankness) and are tallied as indicated:

5. Emphatic - Hesitant (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
6. Passive - Active (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).
7. Fast - Slow (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
8. Meek - Aggressive (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).
10. Bold - Timid (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
12. Aggressive - Unaggressive (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
18. Introverted - Extroverted (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).
19. Energetic - Tired (7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1).
27. Reserved - Frank (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).